

Team A: agree

You will now participate in a “philosophical chairs” type debate on the Dream Act:

The DREAM Act will increase illegal immigration.

You are on the team A, you will **agree** with this statement.

What is the Dream Act?

The dream Act: (Wikipedia.com)

This bill would provide conditional permanent residency to certain undocumented students of good moral character who graduate from US high schools, arrived in the US illegally as minors, and lived in the country continuously for at least five years prior to the bill's enactment. If they were to complete two years in the military or two years at a four year institution of higher learning, the students would obtain temporary residency for a six year period. Within the six year period, a student may qualify who has "acquired a degree from an institution of higher education in the United States or has completed at least 2 years, in good standing, in a program for a bachelor's degree or higher degree in the United States" or have "served in the armed services for at least 2 years and, if discharged, has received an honorable discharge". Military enlistment contracts require an eight year commitment, with active duty commitments typically between four and six years, but as low as two years. "Any alien whose permanent resident status is terminated... shall return to the immigration status the alien had immediately prior to receiving conditional permanent resident status under this Act." This bill would have included undocumented immigrants as old as 35 years of age.

Here is a set of experts from articles you may use to formulate your arguments. Discuss with your team members for 5 minutes and plan your arguments. You will then participate in the debate.

These excerpts are from the Center for Immigration Studies, which claims to be a non partisan organization and is generally opposed to the Dream Act.

<http://cis.org/taxonomy/term/305>

"There is by now substantial evidence, mentioned by all three recent immigration reform task forces, that immigration amnesties create the expectation of future amnesties. If illegal immigrants are bringing their children to the United States. . .what is to keep future generations of illegal immigrants from making exactly the same calculation, buttressed by the not unreasonable expectation of a future DREAM Act?"

- Stanley Renshon, CIS Fellow

exerpts from

The DREAM Act

Testimony Prepared for Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and Border Security

By Steven A. Camarota, June 2011

<http://cis.org/node/2961>

Lack of Immigration Enforcement. Whenever there is an amnesty for illegal immigrants, there is always the concern that it will encourage more illegal immigration in the future. On the understandable assumption that their children might benefit from some future legalization, more people may settle in our country illegally if the DREAM Act passes. We all agree that we do not wish to encourage illegal immigration. But S.952 has no provision to discourage future illegal immigration.

Rewards to Parents. All of us can agree that those brought to this country illegally as children are not to blame for their situation. It is their parents who are responsible for their predicament. The parents, therefore, should not benefit from the DREAM Act. However, the DREAM Act as currently constructed would eventually allow many of the parents who put their children in this situation to get legal status because it puts their children on a path to U.S. citizenship. U.S. citizens can sponsor their parents for green cards.

A Question of Fairness. It seems to me that the strongest argument for the DREAM Act is a moral one—those who came as children, through no fault of their own, should be allowed to stay. But if the moral argument is correct, why require two years of college? How does the ability to do college-level work give someone a greater moral claim? Someone who came at age two and has lived here for 20 years but did not graduate high school, would seem to have a much stronger claim on our conscience than someone who finds college work relatively easy but came at age 14 and has been in the country for only five years. Under the DREAM Act the former would not receive legal status, while the later would be legalized.

What Would the DREAM Act Do to Higher Education?

By [David North](#), July 9, 2010

<http://cis.org/north/dream-act-higher-education>

Does the U.S. want to push about two million, mostly not-very-interested-in-education young people into our already overcrowded and under-funded colleges so that they can claim legal status in the U.S., which they now lack?

That's one question that is *not* asked in a new report on the proposed DREAM Act, a specialized amnesty proposal that relates to people who came to the U.S. illegally before the age of 16.

Discussions of the DREAM Act ("Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors"), of course, focus on immigration policy, and they should. In addition, however, there is a very real education policy question – should we push people who would not otherwise voluntarily attend college into higher education primarily because they want legal status, not because they want to learn?

Isn't that a distortion of what higher education is all about? What would a more or less compulsory attendance policy for the estimated two million beneficiaries do to the educational institutions? To their finances, and those of the taxpayers? To the other students, all voluntary seekers of knowledge? (Or career advancement?)

The report in question, issued yesterday, is entitled "[DREAM vs. Reality: An Analysis of Potential DREAM Act Beneficiaries](#)," by Jeanne Batlova and Margie McHugh and published by the Migration Policy Institute, a Washington, D.C., think tank.

The report is useful for several reasons.

First, it underlines the large population that would be covered by the proposal, and confirms [numerical estimates](#) first made three years ago by the Center's Steven Camarota. It is interesting to note that this very partial proposed amnesty would cover 2,149,000 people; that is close to the 2.9 million that were involved with what we all thought was a pretty comprehensive legalization program (IRCA's amnesty) 20 years ago.

Second, it breaks out separate estimates, within the 2.1 million, of people who would be eligible for the various subprograms and requirements of the DREAM Act.

Third, it shows that a little amnesty is never enough to satisfy the true believers. One of the authors is quoted in the MPI [press release](#) as complaining about the act's provisions, saying, "Many potential DREAM Act beneficiaries would face difficulties in meeting the legislation's higher education or military service requirements because of hardship paying for college tuition, competing work and family time demands and low education attainment and English proficiency."

That may sound like a population that needs schooling, but not one that would likely do well in a college or university. (Were the DREAM Act to pass, a few of the beneficiaries would, of course, do splendidly, and MPI would tell us about their successes.)

The act, generally, would grant a (longish) path to green card status to people who came to the U.S. illegally before 16, at least five years ago, and have obtained a high school diploma or a GED. Those qualifications would make them conditional entrants; to move to green card status they would also need to spend two years in either post-secondary education (including community colleges) or in the military. There appears to be no requirement that anyone finish college.

The act is attractive to mass migration advocates because they do not seem to be doing very well with their broader proposal for "comprehensive immigration reform."